

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

<b>TRESHAUN JAKE, #M-41768</b>	)	
	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>CIVIL NO. 16-cv-00477-SMY</b>
	)	
<b>MICHAEL HOF,</b>	)	
<b>JOHN DOE 1 (BADGE #652),</b>	)	
<b>JOHN DOE 2,</b>	)	
<b>KENT BROOKMAN,</b>	)	
<b>MICHAEL KEYS,</b>	)	
<b>LORI OAKLEY, and</b>	)	
<b>KIMBERLY BUTLER,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

**YANDLE, District Judge:**

This action came before the Court on Plaintiff Treshaun Jake's Complaint filed April 29, 2016 (Doc. 1). On May 23, 2016, the Court dismissed the Complaint for failure to state a claim and ordered Jake to file an amended complaint within 35 days (by June 28, 2016) (Doc. 6). In its May 23, 2016 Order, the Court clearly stated that in order to proceed on his claims, Jake would need to provide additional information tending to suggest that: defendants violated his rights in a disciplinary investigation; that defendants who allegedly failed to respond to grievances also participated in the underlying deprivation; and, that he would need to clarify his intent to pursue a retaliation or Fifth Amendment violation (Doc. 6 at 7).

The Court also expressly notified Jake that it was not acceptable to file piecemeal amendments or additions to his original Complaint, and that the original Complaint would be dismissed in its entirety (Doc. 6 at 7-8). The Order also expressly warned Jake that failure to file

an amended complaint, captioned “First Amended Complaint,” would result in dismissal of his action with prejudice (*Id.*).

Despite the Court’s guidance, Jake failed to provide any additional information of the kind the Court clearly outlined. In fact, Jake’s First Amended Complaint is a verbatim recitation of his original Complaint—though the Court notes that there is a perceptible difference in the handwriting of the two documents (Docs. 1, 8). Accordingly, the Court now dismisses this case for Jake’s failure to comply with an order of this Court, and thus for failure to state a plausible claim for relief. In light of the insufficiency of Jake’s filings, and his failure to comply with the Court’s order, the Court has rendered the following decision:

**IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** this action is **DISMISSED**. **Dismissal is with prejudice**, and shall count as a **strike** for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to enter Judgment in favor of the Defendants and against Plaintiff Jake.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: November 7, 2016**

s/ STACI M. YANDLE  
**STACI M. YANDLE**  
**United States District Judge**